/317 cont./

*631 of Tazenakht, has completely disappeared since the masters of
*634 Telwet reduced the whole confederation of the Aït Waouzgit to
175 servitude; but we know at least that the last of these amghars
616 exercised their command in the manner of their Tazenakht
[178] neighbors; two brothers united to deal with the affairs that interested the two leffs; each side could thus find an advocate devoted to its interests in the very family of the amghars, and the decision made afterward in common by the two brothers thus permitted, under the best possible conditions, conciliating the opposing interests."

*631 The common custom in the Sous and in the Atlas of thus
*634 sharing the command between two brothers or two cousins ap-
593 pears to us to be explained most often by the desire of the chiefs
•605 to keep a fair balance between the leffs or the hostile soffs within
182 their tribes. Such a practice is possible only for chiefs who have
616 succeeded in dominating and conciliating internal rivalries (1).
[578]

1. Perhaps one should also see there an Arab influence explicable among the tribes adjacent to the Sahara. The government of a tribe entrusted to two brothers and, as a consequence, later to two branches of the same family at once is in the tradition of the desert. Cf. G. Marçais, Les Arabes en Berbérie /The Arabs in Barbary/, p. 704.

*634 VI. The tribal chief rises above the leffs. -- All these examples chosen in the western Haut-Atlas /High Atlas/ and the country of the Sirwa enable us to understand clearly how the amghar, chief of a canton, manages the conquest of a tribe.

As long as the Berbère /Berber/ chief remains the champion of a leff, his power is based on the existence of social forces independent of his will and which he directs only imperfectly. The resources that he can draw from war are moreover limited, for he
*[631] must give his allies their share of the booty. Consequently, when
[648] he has not gone beyond that lower degree of authority, he often